

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/119,427	07/20/1998	MARY ELLEN SIKSA	WH997-001	1077

7590 09/02/2004  
ANNE VACHON DOUGHERTY  
3173 CEDAR ROAD  
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

09/119,427

**Applicant(s)**

SIKSA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Charles E Anya

**Art Unit**

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2 is/are rejected. *→ 1-4, 6-9, 11-15, 17-24 and 28*
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to. *→ 5, 10, 16, 25-27*
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) \*
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-28 are pending in this application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-4,6-9,11-15,17,18,21,22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,911,068 to Zimmerman et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,424,354 B1 to Matheny et al.**

4. As to claim 1, Zimmerman teaches system for providing enhanced functionality for handling each event of at least one event received at the application display area of a window object having a plurality of window controls (Col. 11 Ln. 58 – 67, figure 10 Col. 12 Ln. 1 – 67, Col. 13 Ln. 1 – 50) comprising: a plurality of control enhancer objects each providing an interface to one specific window application control for said window object (“...event handlers...” Col. 11 Ln. 58 – 67), and list of said control enhancer objects for said window object whereby said window object passes an event received at the application display area all of said control enhancer objects on said list and wherein said control enhancer objects determine which of said plurality of control enhancer

Art Unit: 2126

objects should handle the received event (“...extended control...” Col. 12 Ln. 1 –14, Col. 13 Ln. 21 – 50).

5. Zimmerman does not explicitly teach control enhancer objects being customized with specific behaviors from a plurality of base classes and subclasses.

6. Matheny teaches control enhancer objects being customized with specific behaviors from a plurality of base classes and subclasses (Col. 12 Ln. 30 – 37).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Matheny and Zimmerman because the teaching of Matheny would improve the system of Zimmerman by providing a means for manipulating data (Col. 12 Ln. 30 – 37).

8. As to claim 2, Matheny teaches the system of claim 1 wherein each of said plurality of control enhancer objects is customized with at least one data storage handler (Col. 12 Ln. 50 – 62).

9. As to claim 3, Matheny teaches the system of claim wherein each of said plurality of control enhancer objects is customized with at least one data initializer (Col. 18 Ln. 59 – 64).

10. As to claim 4, Matheny teaches the system of claim 1 wherein each of said plurality of control enhancer objects is customized with at least one data finalizer (Col. 17 Ln. 14 – 19).

11. As to claim 6, Matheny the system of claim 1 wherein at least one of said control enhancer objects further comprises means for determining limits to be placed on data related to said control enhancer object (Col. 4 Ln. 20 – 22).

12. As to claim 7, Matheny teaches the system of claim 4 wherein at least one of said control enhancer objects further comprises means for validating data at said data finalizer (Col. 17 Ln. 43 – 50).

13. As to claim 8, Zimmerman teaches the system of Claim 1 wherein at least one of said control enhancer objects further comprises means for identifying data related to the window control of said at least one control enhancer object (Col. 11 Ln. 58 – 67).

14. As to claim 9, see the rejection of claims 1- 4 above.

15. As to claims 11 – 13, see the rejection of claims 6 – 8 above.

16. As to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

17. As to claim 15, Zimmerman teaches the method of claim wherein said window comprises a control enhancer object list of event a affecting each of said listed control enhancer objects comprises: accessing said list of events and comparing said received

Art Unit: 2126

event to said list of events and determining interested control enhancer objects based on said comparing (Col. 11 Ln. 58 – 67, figure 10 Col. 13 Ln. 17 – 50).

18. As to claim 17, Zimmerman as modified by Matheny teaches a method for rapid graphical user interface development for providing an enhanced control for event handling on a window Col. 11 Ln. 58 – 67, figure 10 Col. 12 Ln. 1 – 67, Col. 13 Ln. 1 – 50), comprising the steps of: creating a plurality of base classes and discrete behaviors (Matheny Col. 12 Ln. 30 – 37), subclasses for creating at least one window application control for said window instantiating said window for said control; a control enhancer object as an interface to customizing said control enhancer object by associating selected behaviors to it using said plurality of classes and subclasses; and passing a pointer for said control to said control enhancer (“...pointer...” Col. 12 Ln.15 – 25). Also see the rejection of claim 1.

19. As to claim 18, Zimmerman teaches the method of Claim 17 wherein said associating comprises the steps of: determining special data handling is required; and instantiating at least one data handler if special handing is required; and assigning said data handler to said control enhancer object (Col. 12 Ln. 1 – 11).

20. As to claim 21, Matheny teaches the method of claim 17, wherein said associating comprises the steps of: determining if special data finalization is required;

instantiating at least one data finalizer if special finalization is required; and assigning said at least one data finalizer to said control enhancer object (Col. 17 Ln. 14 – 19).

21. As to claim 22, see the rejection of claim 21.

22. As to claim 28, see the rejection of claim 17 above.

**23. Claims 19,20,23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,911,068 to Zimmerman et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,424,354 B1 to Matheny et al. as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,89,668 to Beaudet et al.**

24. As to claim 19, Zimmerman as modified by Matheny is silent with reference to the method of Claim 17 wherein said associating comprises the steps of: determining if special initialization is required; instantiating at least one data initializer special initialization is required; and assigning said at least one data initializer to said control enhancer object.

25. Beaudet teaches the method of Claim 17 wherein said associating comprises the steps of: determining if special initialization is required; instantiating at least one data initializer special initialization is required; and assigning said at least one data initializer to said control enhancer object (Col. 5 Ln. 3 – 16).



Art Unit: 2126

26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Beaudet, Matheny and Zimmerman because the teaching of Beaudet would improve the system of Zimmerman as modified by Matheny by providing a means for indicating selection level (Col. 5 Ln. 3 – 16).

27. As to claim 20, see the rejection of claim 19 above.

28. As to claims 23 and 24, see the rejection of claim 21 above.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

29. Claims 5,10,16 and 25-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

30. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng-Ai can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Charles E Anya  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2126

cea.

  
MENG-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100